

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant and her attorney thank the Examiner for taking the time to conduct the telephonic interview on October 9, 2007.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-7 and 14-21 are now pending in this application.

Claims 8-13 were previously cancelled.

Claims 19-21 are newly added.

Election/Restriction

It is noted that the Applicant elected Claims 1-7 (and not 1-6 as indicated in the action at page 2) and Claims 14-18 without traverse in the response to the restriction requirement filed on March 9, 2007. Additionally, the Applicant *cancelled* Claims 8-13 (as opposed to withdrawing these claims) while also reserving the right to pursue these claims in a subsequently filed divisional application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S. C. Section 112

Claims 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112 as being indefinite. These claims have been amended, as such, the rejection of these claims is now believed to be moot.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S. C. Section 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,347,428 to Shimko et al.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP §2143.03 (citing to *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)). As discussed in the telephonic interview with the Examiner on October 9th, Shimko fails to teach, let alone suggest, any pump that is coupled to and powered by a motor, as required by independent Claims 1 and 14. Thus, Claims 1 and 14 are believed to be allowable over Shimko for at least this reason.

In addition, since dependent claims include all recitations of the claims from which they depend, and so Claims 2-7 and 15-18 are allowable for at least the reason noted regarding Claims 1 and 14. Additionally, at least dependent Claims 5 and 16 are believed to contain additional patentable subject matter in that each of these claims includes the requirement that the solution dispensing spray jets are for pulsatingly spraying the cleaning solution towards the garment. Such teaching is believed to be absent from Shimko.

Accordingly, Claims 1-7 and 14-18 are believed to patentably define over the teachings of Shimko and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Newly added Claims


Claims 19-21 are newly added and support for the amendments is believed to be found in the application as filed. These claims are also believed to patentably define over Shimko. As noted above, it is believed that Shimko does not teach, let alone suggest, a pump coupled to and powered by the motor. Moreover, and as discussed in the telephonic interview on October 9th, it is believed that Shimko does not teach, let alone suggest that the coupling of the pump to the motor provides for a pulsating spray of garment cleaning solution, as required by Claim 19. And further still, Shimko does not teach, let alone suggest, that the coupling of the pump to the motor provides for a pulsating spray of garment cleaning solution from the garment cleaning solution reservoir via the plurality of solution dispensing spray jets to the localized soiled area of the garment, as claimed in Claim 19. Claims 20-21 depend from Claim 19 and thus these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reason noted in support of Claim 19.

Conclusion

The Applicants believe that the amendment and cancellation of claims, and the above comments, puts the application in condition for allowance.

A two month extension fee of \$230.00 is believed to be due for the filing of this Amendment and Response, and this fee should be charged to Deposit Account 23-2053. Any required petition should be considered provisionally made.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Pienkos, Esq.
Registration No. 46,992

Dated: October 26th, 2007

P.O. ADDRESS:

WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C.
555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
(414) 273-2100
Customer No. 022202